



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/421,332 10/18/99 SAKAI

K 0557-4628-2-

MM22/0303

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND
MAIER & NEUSTADT PC
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVID HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON VA 22202

EXAMINER

PHAN, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED:

03/03/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/421,332

Applicant(s)

SAKAI ET AL.

Examiner

Phan, J.

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
- ☐ received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) ____.
 - ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 14) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 15) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 16) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 19) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

Reissue Applications

Oath/Declaration

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414) because of the following:

The full name of each inventor (family name and at least one given name together with any initial) has not been set forth.

It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

It does not identify the city and state or foreign country of residence of each inventor.

It does not include the notary's signature.

It does not identify the corrections made to the specification in columns 1, 2, and 11.

*J-P
6/21/00*
1-7 and 9-15
Claims ~~1-15~~ are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

*J-P
6/21/00*
1-7 and 9-15
Claims ~~1-15~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being improperly broadened in a reissue application made and sworn to by the assignee and not the patentee.

Claim Objections

Claims 5 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claims 5 and 12, lines 5-6 and 4, respectively, "a light beam" should be changed to --the pair of light beams--. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2872

Specification

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the light source" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

j.p.
6/21/00
Claims 1-~~15~~^{7 and 9-15} are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Nowhere in the original disclosure is there a support for the multi-beam optical scanner having met the condition $2 < \beta < 8.5$ without a coupling lens. The original disclosure requires the multi-beam optical scanner to have a coupling lens, a first image-formation system, and a second image-formation system in order to satisfy the condition. See column 3, lines 13-15 and column 6, lines 16-26.

Art Unit: 2872

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-6 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Appel et al.

Appel et al discloses an image forming apparatus (50) which comprises a multi-beam optical scanner. The multi-beam optical scanner comprises a light source (multiple laser diode 56) for providing light beams A and B, a coupling lens (84) for collimating light beams A and B, a first image-formation system (cylindrical lens 88) for forming line images on the reflecting surface 92 of an optical deflector (rotating polygon mirror 60), and a second image-formation system (f-theta scan lens 94, cylindrical mirror 98) for separating the light beams A and B and converging the light beams into light spots for scanning a scanned surface (photoreceptor 64). The multi-beam optical scanner having a lateral magnification of 127/25 or 5.08. See FIGS. 1-8 and the accompanying text.

In re claim 6 lens 94b has been taken as a lengthy lens.

In re claims 10 and 11 see the teaching in column 7, line 76 through column 8, line 2. Note that the use of light source having LED light emitting sections in combination is a conventional alternative.

Art Unit: 2872

Claims 1-6 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Genovese.

Genovese discloses an image forming apparatus (50) which comprises a multi-beam optical scanner. The multi-beam optical scanner comprises a light source (multiple laser diode 56) for providing light beams A and B, a coupling lens (70) for collimating light beams A and B, a first image-formation system (cylindrical lens 72, see column 4, lines 55-56) for forming line images on the reflecting surface 92 of an optical deflector (rotating polygon mirror 60, see column 5, lines 14-21), and a second image-formation system (f-theta scan lens 80 and wobble cylindrical lens 82) for separating the light beams A and B and converging the light beams into light spots for scanning a scanned surface (photoreceptor 64). The multi-beam optical scanner having a lateral magnification of $127/25$ or 5.08. See FIGS. 1-2 and the accompanying text.

In re claim 6 lens 80 has been taken as a lengthy lens.

In re claims 10 and 11 see the teaching in column 4, lines 9-11. Note that the use of light source having LED light emitting sections in combination is a conventional alternative.

Art Unit: 2872

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appel et al or Genovese in view of Kamikubo.

Each of Appel et al and Genovese discloses a multi-beam optical scanner having all the structure as discussed in the rejections of claims 1-6 and 9-15 under 35 USC 102(a) on pages 4-5. The difference between claim 7 and Appel et al or Genovese is that while claim 7 uses an image-forming mirror and a lengthy lens for the second image-formation system, Appel et al and Genovese use f-theta scan lens. However, the use of an image-forming mirror and a lengthy lens instead of f-theta scan lens is a well known alternative (see the use of image-forming mirror 40 and lengthy lens 41 instead of f-theta scan lens 20 in Kamikubo, column 6, line 65 through column 7, line 3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replace the f-theta scan lens in each of Appel et al and Genovese with an image-forming mirror and a lengthy lens as an alternative for the common feature.

Art Unit: 2872

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Phan whose telephone number is (703) 308-4810. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 to 6:00 PM.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Phan, J.
February 22, 2000


James Phan
Primary Examiner